

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are pending in the application, with 1 and 8 being the independent claims. Claims 2 and 9 have been cancelled herein, without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. No new claims are sought to be added.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite the language in now cancelled claims 2 and 9. Claims 3 and 10 have been amended to depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively. Claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 have been amended to delete the term "soft." Support for this amendment can be found, *inter alia*, at paragraph 32 of the application as filed.

These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the term "soft polymer mold," as used in claims 1, 4, 8 and 11, was alleged to be a relative term which does not provide a standard for ascertaining the scope of the invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that the method of the presently claimed invention is suitable for use with any polymer mold. Thus, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 8 and 11 to delete the term "soft." Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Sandor *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,554,432). *See* Office Action, p. 3. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited document or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the cited document, (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) the cited document must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the cited document, and not be based on Applicants' disclosure. *See* M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j) and cases cited therein. The Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Amended claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are directed to a method of fabricating a patterned polymer film, the method comprising: filling particles in a pattern provided to a polymer mold to prepare an embossed stamp, and coating a polymer impregnation-prevention layer on the pattern; The method of the present invention is useful for fabrication of small electronic and optical devices.

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Sandor *et al.* relates to printing images on paper or plastic and fabricating a lenticular polymer lens surface. Sandor *et al.* discloses methods of preparing lenticular sheets by processes involving the engraving of a master relief pattern comprising molding and embossment, and stamping or embossing the relief pattern into a thermoset material. However, Sandor *et al.* does not disclose or suggest the filling of particles in a relief pattern for fabrication of small electronic and optical devices and coating a polymer impregnation-prevention layer on the pattern.

The Examiner generally alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to fill the relief patterns described by Sandor *et al.* with particles to practice the method of the present invention. However, the Examiner has not pointed to a specific motivation to modify the disclosure in Sandor *et al.* to make the claimed invention, and Sandor *et al.* also fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Because Sandor *et al.* does not describe or suggest filling particles in a pattern provided to a polymer mold to prepare an embossed stamp, and coating a polymer impregnation-prevention layer on the pattern the use of a polymer impregnation-preventing layer, the method of the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Other Matters

Applicants acknowledge Examiner's citation of Jacobson *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,517,995), Jang *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,656,790), and Mau *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,866,801) as relevant art.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Judith U. Kim
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,679

Date: December 28, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

478739.1